

E 380
.N265

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00005079470





AN ADDRESS

TO THE FREEMEN OF KENTUCKY,

From a CONVENTION OF DELEGATES friendly to the re-election of JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, as President of the United States, and held in the town of Frankfort, on the 17th, 18th, and 19th days of December, 1827.

The right of any body of men to assemble together to consult of and devise means to promote their best interests, is embraced in the definition of freedom. Availing ourselves of that right, we have met on behalf of the friends of the present administration of the General Government, throughout the state, with a view of concentrating their energies, and of uniting their efforts, in the cause which we deem of vital importance to the prosperity and happiness of the country. It is surely consonant to the spirit and genius of our free institutions, that the people should meet together, whenever they think proper, and if at any time it is inconvenient for them to do so, they who choose, may have their sentiments expressed by persons appointed to represent them. It is a right exercised by those opposed to us in political sentiment, and of which no freeman can or ought to complain. If the discussion, by a body of freemen, of political subjects and of the relative pretensions of opposing candidates, to the first office in the gift of the people, is to be condemned as dangerous to liberty, it will not be long before it will be considered as equally dangerous for a single individual to express his sentiments. The members of this convention disclaim on their part, any dictation to any portion of the community at large, they ask for themselves, their only wish they are willing to grant to every one else. They have no private interest to gratify, no deep rooted hatred to indulge, no individual interest to preserve. They know that they are clothed with no authority, they feel that they are all members of the same great community, and as such, and such only, they present this address to the public.

An appeal made to the sober sense and reason of the people, at a period of high political excitement; is too often received with cold indifference by the zealous partizans on either side. We will, however, proceed to investigate, with calmness and impartiality, the relative pretensions of the two distinguished individuals before the people, for the highest office in their gift.

What is the nation, or Kentucky in particular, to gain by the election of Andrew Jackson to the Presidency of the United States? What great work is to be promoted, what system is to be proposed, what measures to be adopted, to benefit the nation or our own state? General Jackson maintains a mysterious silence, and while one state is zealous in his support, because he is opposed to the constitutional right of Congress to make roads and effect other internal improvements, another is supporting him with equal warmth, as an enemy and friend of what has been emphatically termed the "American System." Is it right that this individual should receive the support of different states, when at the time he receives it, he is perfectly aware that one or the other must be deceived in the course he will pursue? Is it consistent with the manly, independent and open character which his friends give him upon all occasions, for him quietly to fold his arms, and with apparent indifference to behold the freemen of a whole state giving him their votes, because he is in favor of the Tariff and of internal improvements; while another portion of our Union support him, not as their choice, but solely on the ground of his being opposed to these measures? Is the office of President of the United States

National Republican 1827

one of such high and transcendent dignity, that its aspirants should rather suffer whole communities to remain in a state of deception, than to develop a single opinion entertained? It will be answered, that the General has declared himself in favor of a "judicious Tariff." But what definite meaning can be attached to these terms? What a Southern politician might consider a judicious Tariff, would be considered by the people of Kentucky as withering the energies and resources of the country. The former might consider that Tariff judicious, which was imposed for the purpose of revenue, while Pennsylvania, Ohio and Kentucky, would consider that injudicious, which did not have for its object the protection of domestic manufactures. The term "judicious," as applied by General Jackson, has a most latitudinous import. Any course that he may choose to pursue should he be elected, would bring him within the only pledge he has given. Shall Kentucky jeopardize that great system with which her interest is so blended and identified, by the hasty indulgence of feelings, produced by enthusiasm for military fame? Shall she take a leap in the dark and put down the present administration, for sustaining the very measures which she has been loudest in advocating? It is much feared if General Jackson should be elevated to the Presidential chair, that the great work of internal improvement is to be immolated on the altar of the constitution. We have the testimony of one man of distinguished ability and reputation, that he has already declared himself in favor of that construction of the constitution, in opposition to which the virtuous Madison has raised his voice. His warm friends and partizans throughout the Union, have arrayed themselves against the exercise, on the part of the General Government, of this all important power. It was by the casting vote of his intimate friend, the Vice-President, that the Illinois canal so important to a large section of Kentucky, was entirely defeated. The agriculturalists in the southern part of this state, looked with anxious expectation to the opening of that communication with the northern lake. It was through that channel that they hoped to have a portion of the agricultural products of this country, withdrawn from the great southern emporium, ~~by the means~~ that they soon expected a lucrative and most advantageous exchange of commodities between the north and west. They have now only to regret that a measure considered as constitutional and right when recommended by one man, at one time, should be viewed by the same person, at a different period, under the excitement of party feeling, as impolitic and transcending the limits of the great charter of our liberties. It is not pretended that General Jackson is to be made accountable for all the votes of his friends, yet it is a fair inference, that if elected, he will not form his cabinet from among his enemies. It must, from the nature of things, be concluded, that it will be composed from the number of the distinguished individuals who now deny the right of the General government, to interfere in the promotion of the "general welfare," by the erection of a single work of internal improvement, or by the extension of a single chain to bind together the different and distant portions of our extended territory. The father of his country, early saw the importance of connecting the eastern and western parts of the United States, by roads and canals, and of thus uniting distant countries. Under the auspices of Thomas Jefferson, the great national work, the Cumberland road was commenced, to which the demon of party of the present day, would seem to say "thus far shalt thou go but no farther."

It would be transcending the limits of this address, to go into an argument upon the importance of internal improvements, to the prosperity of this country. It need only be remarked, that every portion of the United States should find a ready market for its agricultural products; and that legislator, by whose means one cent is added to the price, per pound, of Pork, Flour, Lard, &c. deserves the gratitude of his country. The cotton growing and sugar planting States, have flourished to an immense extent, under the fostering and protecting care of the General

Government. A duty of three cents per pound upon the articles of their produce, secures to them an invaluable home market, while the numerous acts passed for the protection of commerce, guaranty the safety of their exports. The population of these states amount to little upwards of two millions; while that of the grain growing and manufacturing districts, amount to upwards of five millions and a half. The whole exports of the United States to Great Britain last year, amounted to upwards of twenty millions of dollars; of which about three fourths was in cotton, while the flour, corn, rye, oats and every species of grain for the year 1825, amounted to the sum of eighty-eight dollars; and all kinds of animal food to thirty-four dollars; while at the same time, we imported into the United States from Great Britain, forty-two millions of her merchandize. Is it a matter then, of no importance to the western country, which it is well known, has heretofore been flooded with British merchandize, to multiply, by roads and canals, the only markets which we can have for the products of our soil? What sea remains unexplored, what port unvisited by the enterprise of our seamen, to gather riches to pour into the lap of Great Britain? We have not yet, in reality, shaken off the fetters of our colonial vassallage. We still look to that country for our work-shops. Thousands of her artizans are daily employed in the manufacturing of articles for American consumption, while they will not receive in exchange for them one cents worth of the agricultural products of this country. The question is now presented to our agriculturalists; if they will longer purchase from a nation which will not purchase from them. Will they still buy from those who will not be fed by them, or by the encouragement of that system, which is truly American in its character, sustain and support the artizan who receives his daily sustenance at their hands. If all other nations would unfetter commerce, abolish their restrictive and prohibitory systems, and meet us upon the ground, of fair and equal reciprocity, there would be plausibility in the argument of those who oppose the Tariff. But when other nations are on the alert, and perpetually waging a commercial warfare by their restrictive systems, imposing high duties on our productions, or prohibiting them altogether, we believe with the departed sage of Monticello, that it would be proper "for us to do the same by theirs; first burdening or excluding those productions which they bring here, in competition with our own of the same kind; selecting next, such manufactures as we take from them in greatest quantity, and which at the same time, we could the soonest furnish to ourselves or obtain from other countries. The oppression of our agriculture in foreign ports, would thus be made the occasion of relieving it from a dependence on the councils and conduct of others, and of promoting arts, manufactures and commerce at home." The same venerated authority speaks a more emphatic language in his letter to Mr Austin, in which he says, "to be dependent for the comforts of life, we must fabricate them ouaselves. We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturalist. * * * * The grand enquiry now is, shall we make our own comforts or go without them, at the will of a foreign nation. He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufactures, must be either for reducing us to a dependence on that nation, or be clothed in skins and live like wild beasts, in dens and caverns. I am proud to say, I am not one of these." Yet Mr Giles, who stands at the head of the opposition, in the state of Virginia, and is one of the warmest and most zealous supporters of General Jackson in the United States, has proclaimed to the world, "that it is unconstitutional for the General Government to protect our own manufactures." To what a

miserable condition would the people of Kentucky and of the western and middle states be reduced. if this doctrine should be received as correct! We no sooner lay a duty upon a foreign article, than the effect of our legislation is counteracted by the British parliament, and many, without intending it, make their views subservient to British interests.

In the year 1824, the Congress of the United States laid an ad valorem duty upon foreign woollens of thirty-three and a third per cent. It was laid with reference to the existing duties in England, which was then on common wool six pence sterling per pound. This duty was reduced to one penny per pound, on all such wool imported into England. This was not all—The duty on Olive oil was reduced from 115 to 12 the ton of 252 gallons to 17; that on Indigo was reduced about the like proportion; that on logwood was reduced from 9s 4 to 4s 6 per ton. The whole of which is estimated as operating a repeal, in effect, by the British parliament, of at least one half the duty imposed on their woollens by the Tariff of 1824. We are now certain of an administration, quietly pursuing the foot steps of Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Monroe, unostentatiously performing the various multiplied and important duties devolving upon it, and with manly firmness and energy, recommending the adoption of those measures, which we believe, will promote the lasting happiness and prosperity of the country. What may be effected by a change, we are not prepared to say. One thing as patriots and as lovers of the free institutions under which we live, we can but regret and deeply deplore—the enthusiasm manifested for military fame—the disposition exhibited by a portion of the American people, to bestow the first civil office in their gift, from the effusions of gratitude, upon a valiant and successful soldier. The American people, in the full tide of successful experiment, should still remember that they are not exempt from the infirmities of human nature. The history of all republics, speaks in a language of admonition to us. It is never by open violence, by direct and positive force, that the liberty of the people is destroyed. It is by the creation of a strong party in the land, subservient to its leader, by winning the affections and appealing to the gratitude of the people. The history of usurpation, when traced, will be found in all instances, to have originated by exciting the administration of the multitude. Bonaparte's name was adored by the people he oppressed, and the death of Cæsar avenged by those he enslaved. The baneful influence of the example which would be set, is what should be guarded against. Who can say that the people, in a moment of military fervor for a successful general, would never lose sight of the constitution and liberty of their country? Symptoms of adulation are already beginning to exhibit themselves, which may hereafter prove dangerous to our dearest rights. The victory of New Orleans, will always present a bright page in the history of our country; but since its achievement to the present moment it has not been thought necessary, that the General should repair to the spot, to celebrate its anniversary, and that delegates should be sent from different parts of the country, to congratulate him on his success. Why was not this done sooner? What new tie, what new bond of gratitude has been sealed since the 8th of January 1815? Was it customary in the days of Washington, for him to travel hundreds of miles to celebrate a victory he had himself achieved, and that on the eve of an election, at which he was a candidate? The triumph of the Roman General was always decreed to him immediately after his return from the field of battle. Does General Jackson think that the honors awarded him immediately after his battle, were not

commensurate with the glory he gained, and does he desire a second time to pass under the triumphal arch, and have his temples again bound by the mockery of a crown? What but military fame could shield a man from the effects of a course of this kind? What but the dazzling effect of success, could ever have extorted from intelligent and high minded freemen, a sentence of approbation for the open violation of the constitution at New Orleans, in the suspension of the habeas corpus? What civil functionary of the government, stripped of his military cloak, would dare to say to the people I have openly and knowingly violated your constitution, but I did it from necessity—I did it for your goods. All succeeding generals from the precedent set, are now at liberty to become the judges of this necessity, and to say when the constitution is to be violated, and when not.

It is hardly possible to conceive of any thing more fraught with danger to the republic, than the example which has thus been set. How often if elected President, he may think the safety of the people required the constitution to be violated, remains yet to be seen. Yet his partizans ascribe honor and glory to him for his worst errors and openly vindicate the correctness of this violation of the constitution, the forcible and lawless dissolution of the legislative assembly, and the imprisonment of a judge for the discharge of a duty he was bound to perform by his oath of office. What but the insatiation arising from military zeal could enlist talents and learning in defence of the execution of the six militia men, after their term of service had expired, and when they were told by their officers, that there was no law longer to detain them? Had not the sunshine of prosperity shed its beams around him, or had disaster and defeat marked his footsteps, what would have been the sentence of an impartial public, and of posterity, upon this, to say the least of it, unnecessary effusion of the blood of free born American citizens? The war was at an end, and he had already written to one of the heads of department, that the enemy had left our shores; but we delight not to dwell upon these blots in the character of Andrew Jackson; we would not pluck one leaf from the wreath which fame had entwined around his temples. We mention them to show, that the grossest excesses in the character of a military chieftain, united with the splendor of successful achievement, will never fail to find not merely apologists, but admirers.

Without raising the mantle, which we are content should be thrown over his private character, the whole history of the public career of General Jackson, speaks his entire unsuitness for the station to which he aspires. Strip him of the glare of his military reputation, and view his character as a civilian alone, and what claim has he to our support? In what civil station has he distinguished himself, in what walk in life, except in the military line, has he risen above mediocrity? The genius and spirit of our government, its prosperity, the perpetuity and purity of its institutions, demand, that its destinies should be wielded by statesmen and not mere soldiers. Give him all the patriotism and devotion to his country which have been ascribed to him, still we are riveted in the conviction, that General Jackson does not possess the necessary qualifications for the exalted.

station of President. The uncontrollable impetuosity and violence of his temper, are manifested in almost every act of his life. The constitution and laws interpose no barrier against the prosecution of any thing he undertakes. In his famous letter to Mr. Swartwout, sentiments are avowed, which show how little he would be governed if elected President, by the inconvenient limits of a constitution. In speaking of the violation of that instrument at New-Orleans, he says it was done for "the honor, the safety and glory of our country." He then proceeds to say, that "that man who in times of difficulty & danger, shall halt at any course necessary to maintain the rights, & privileges and independence of his country, is unsuited to authority." Augustus Cæsar, when he laid the splendid foundation for the future despotism of his country, did not halt at any course which he proclaimed to be necessary to maintain "the rights, and privileges & independence of his country." Every despot who has ever trampled under foot, the constitution and liberty of his country, has screened himself under the pretext, that it was done for the honor and glory of that country, or to maintain "the rights and privileges of the people." We enter our most solemn protest against the doctrine, that any individual, clothed with authority, when his own mind shall come to the conclusion, that a particular measure is "*necessary* to maintain the rights, and privileges and independence of the country," should feel himself authorized to pursue any course, to attain his object. Why have a constitution or a limited form of government, if its functionaries should, nevertheless, feel themselves at liberty to pursue any course, which in their opinion, is "*necessary* to maintain, the rights, and privileges and independence of the country."

Of despotism under General Jackson, in the present situation of our country, we entertain no fears. But if elected President, and time shall roll on in his course, until the party collisions of the present day shall be buried in oblivion, who can tell that some ambitious chieftain may not act upon the very sentiment which we have here condemned, and not "halt at any course" to reach the summit of his ambition, or as would be said "which was necessary to maintain the rights, and privileges and independence of the country." We cannot say that we admired much, the selection which he made of the person to whom he has thus unbosomed himself: the name of Swartwout makes a conspicuous figure in the history of Aaron Burr. We well remember, also, in the bitter controversy between General Jackson and General Adair, when the old story of the latter's connexion with Colonel Burr, was thrown up to him by General Jackson, that he gave him the following courteous retort; "That this affair relates only to him [Jackson] and myself alone. Whatever were the intentions of Colonel Burr, I neither organized troops, nor did I superintend the building of boats for him; nor did I write confidential letters, recommending him to my friends, nor did I think it necessary, after his failure was universally known, to save myself by turning informer or state witness." What was meant by this reply it is unimportant to enquire:

But it is said that General Jackson is the republican candidate, and his partizans in Kentucky have gone so far as to call themselves the republican party; of this state. The warping voice of that party, is drowned in the vociferous acclamations for the hero of New-Orleans. The sentiments of Jefferson, as to the fitness of this man for the Presidency, is no longer a matter of conjecture. Governor Coles, his intimate friend, has at length stated, under his own hand, that he did hear Mr. Jefferson say, "that the disposition on the part of the American people, to elect General Jackson, was the only circumstance, since the revolution, which led him to doubt the durability of our institutions." Are we prepared to disregard the solemn warning of this great and good man, to shut our ears to his prophetic voice, and although we pretend to fight under his banner, to deny his soundest maxims and most wholesome precepts. He had outlived his generation, and "elevated by the serenity of his mind," above the storms of party strife, which beat around him, he looked upon the passing scenes before him, and delivered the unerring judgment of impartial posterity. Shall we not listen to the mild and persuasive voice of Madison, of him who could not "look with composure upon blood and carnage;" whom the sentiment of the age concurs in pronouncing, Father of the constitution? Is the fact of these sages being opposed to the elevation of Jackson evidencethat he is the republican candidate. It is stated and not pretended to be denied, that all the surviving electors, who voted for Mr. Jefferson in 1801, in the state of Virginia, except Mr. Giles alone, are now opposed to the election of Jackson. The politicians of the Jefferson school, have always contended for, and sought men possessing different qualifications from those which it is known characterize General Jackson.

It is said that General Jackson, if elected, will only agree to serve for four years, and this is urged as a reason in favor of his election. How this is ascertained, is not for us to say. Does it come from the general himself? If not, who has a right to say that he will only serve four years? If he should serve one term, and his country should demand his services for a second, after the example of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, would he refuse to serve? Has he thrown aside the sentiment borrowed of the lamented Lowndes, that the office is neither to be sought or declined? Has he said to the swarm of aspirants in his train, "I will only be in your way for one term?" Has he been bargaining in his own ranks, at the very moment he is throwing out the charge of corruption upon his opponents? If not how is it known that he will only serve four years? Did he, when his friend of the south, Mr. Calhoun, withdrew from the list of candidates for the Presidency, and gave him his support, then whisper into his ambitious ear, that one term was all he asked for? If he "burnt no midnight taper," we would ask by whom were the plans devised which suddenly converted a rival into a friend? Shall we displace the present incumbent to gratify the ambition of the "military chieftain," for "one term only?"

At no period since the organization of the government, has the country exhibited a greater degree of prosperity. An undeviating reliance upon the maxims of Washington, a firm adherence to the principles of Jefferson, pure and unsullied patriotism, and incorruptible integrity, we sincerely believe, characterize the present administration. Peace and tranquility at home—respect among foreign nations—an increasing revenue—a diminishing debt—a full treasury—new life and energy in that department, which pours light and information into every vein and artery of our great confederated body—all concur in forcing conviction upon our minds of the virtue and wisdom of those who manage our affairs.

What can we expect to gain by a change for General Jackson? His friends, who compose the opposition, offer no great measure for the consideration of the American people. They propose no system by which we can conceive we would be bettered.—They attempt to clog the wheels of government, and bring into public odium, measures which some of them have at different times advocated, as essential to the happiness and prosperity of the country. Internal improvements, when recommended by Mr. Jefferson, were deemed constitutional. The protection of home industry, and the creation of a home market, when recommended by all preceding Presidents, was considered as demonstrating their desire to emancipate us from a dependence on British industry. But “how unconstitutional, how consolidating, how unequal, how mad,” when the same things are recommended by Mr. Adams.

The tone of complaint and fault finding is rung throughout the country, without better measures being offered or proposed. In one part of the country, where the tariff and internal improvements are supposed to be unpopular, the cry of consolidation and the violation of state rights is rung in the people's ears; in another part, where public opinion has long been settled in favor of this American policy General Jackson is represented as its advocate, his military exploits are blazoned forth, and the state cry of “bargain and corruption” is still continued. At the very moment that the greatest noise is made about intrigues and coalitions, it was announced by a letter from a representative of the people, to the Legislature of the high-minded State of Virginia, that the “combinations” to put down the administration were almost completed. It is a saying which time has sanctioned as true, that those who are conscious of their own moral obliquity, are always most ready to suspect it in others.

The appointment of our distinguished fellow citizen, Henry Clay, to the dignified station he now fills with such honor to himself and benefit to the country, was the signal for the formation of these “combinations” spoken of. When every effort had failed to allure him from that course, which his conscience told him he should pursue—when Gen. Jackson had said that his intimate friend “might say to Mr. Clay and his friends” that he had never intimated that he would continue Mr. Adams in the department of state, and when that friend, in the presence of Mr. Clay, had intimated to a Member of Congress of this State, that if General Jackson was e-

lected, Mr. Clay would be Secretary of State; when all these things could not move him, the infamous letter of 25th January, 1825, which George Kremer was made to father, was published in the *Columbia Observer*, to deter him from the discharge of his duty. Had he felt the justice of the charge exhibited against him, he might, in the language of General Jackson, have sought "safety through covert ways and hidden ambuscades;" but conscious of the purity of his motives, with the indignant feelings of injured innocence, he boldly and fearlessly proclaimed in the public papers, the author of that letter "a base and infamous calumniator, a dastard and a liar." If he had been guilty of the corruption charged against him, what better opportunity could be afforded of making it manifest to the American people? The writer pledged himself to prove, to the satisfaction of unprejudiced minds; the accuracy of his statements, and Mr. Clay demanded an investigation of his conduct from the House of Representatives, stating if he was guilty, that he deserved immediate expulsion. Who was it then, that was in favor of that inquiry? Who was then seeking covert ways and hidden ambuscades? The friends of Mr. Clay were eager for an investigation by the proper tribunal, while nearly all the friends of General Jackson, including *James Buchanan*, the "distinguished member of Congress," McDuffie, Cambrieng, Findlay, Floyd, Hamilton, Houston, Ingham, Randolph Tatnall, and a host of others were opposed to it. If they really believed him guilty why not have voted for an enquiry, and arrayed their evidence against him? Or did it suit purposes better to endeavor to blast his character by secret whispers, and indulge their spleen in sweeping denunciations and empty declamation. Notwithstanding the opposition, a committee was selected by ballot, to investigate his conduct; and although the honorable George Kremer had said he "would cry aloud and spare not," and rose in his seat to express his entire acquiescence, in the course taken by Mr. Clay—when it was made known that the committee was ready to hear the proof, he meanly shrunk from the bold stand he had assumed, and denied the authority of the House of Representatives or their committee to hold him responsible, as he said, for having written the letter. Was it the business of Mr. Clay, then, to go forward and prove that he was not guilty? When his enemies refused to bring forward their evidence, because they had none, and voted against an inquiry into his conduct, was it the part of liberality, of generosity of feeling, of magnanimity of heart, assassination like to stab at his reputation in the dark, and boldly utter charges behind his back, when they had shrunk from a fair and open investigation before his face?

But the scene was not to close here. This was the first act only of the drama which was to be presented to the people of the United States. The Marplot of the piece personated by Carter Beverley made his appearance on the stage. He had been at the hermitage, and had the honor of conversing with General Jackson; who told him before all his company, that Mr. Clay's friends made a propo-

sition to his friends, that if they would premise for him not to put Mr. Adams into the seat of Secretary of State, Clay and his friends would in one hour make him (Jackson) the President. Then comes the version of the story, by General Jackson himself. "That in January, 1825, a member of Congress of high respectability, visited me one morning, and observed—"he had been informed by the friends of Mr. Clay, that the friends of Mr. Adams had made overtures to them, saying, if Mr. Clay and his friends would unite in aid of the election of Mr. Adams, Mr. Clay should be Secretary of State; that the friends of Mr. Adams were urging, as a reason to induce the friends of Mr. Clay to accede to this proposition, that if I was elected President, Mr. Adams would be continued Secretary of State, (in-*uendo*, there would be no room for Kentucky)—that the friends of Mr. Clay stated, that the West did not wish to separate from the West, and if I would say, or permit any of my confidential friends to say, that in case I was elected President, Mr. Adams should not be continued Secretary of State, by a complete union of Mr. Clay and his friends, they would put an end to the Presidential contest in one hour; and he was of opinion it was right to fight such intriguers with their own weapons." Concluding by stating that this important disclosure was made by James Buchanan, a distinguished Member of Congress.

It will be recollected that it was early in January that this disclosure was made, according to General Jackson; yet he remains in the city until the month of March, upon the most friendly and intimate terms with Mr. Buchanan, at the very time, too, that Mr. Clay and his friends were inviting a scrutiny into his conduct, and not a whisper is heard about it, and no further explanation sought of his "distinguished friend." When acting as the guardian of the people's rights, he was to remain silent, for fear of "having ascribed to him improper designs," yet it was not wrong for him, in a mixed company from different states, at his own house, boldly to make the charge of corruption against his competitor for office. He says, "the beginning of this matter was at my own house and fire-side, where surely a freeman may be permitted to speak on public topics, without having ascribed to him improper designs." If this were the beginning of this matter, we would ask what we are to think of the positive assertion of the editor of a paper devoted to his interest, that the same thing was stated to him by General Jackson, in January 1825,

But what says his only witness, Mr. Buchanan, to whom he referred. "I called upon General Jackson upon the occasion which I have mentioned, solely as his friend, upon my own responsibility, and not as the agent of Mr. Clay or any other person. I never have been the political friend of Mr. Clay since he became a candidate for the office of President, as you very well know—The conception never once entered my mind, that he believed me to have been the agent of Mr. Clay or of his friends, or that I had intended to propose to him terms of any kind; from them, or that he could have supposed me

capable of expressing the opinion that it was "right to fight such intriguers with their own weapons!"

The denial of Mr. Buchanan is so clear and unequivocal, it so completely acquits Mr. Clay and his friends of every charge which General Jackson has brought against them, that we believe that his mind must be strangely organized, who can longer doubt upon the subject. General Jackson says he may have done Mr. Clay injustice, if so, the gentleman can explain. That explanation has been made, and the injustice which General Jackson, at his own fire-side, was doing Mr. Clay, is now made manifest to an impartial world. He must, upon this charge, now stand acquitted at the bar of public opinion; acquitted too by the direct, the positive, the explicit statement of General Jackson's own witness. If General Jackson possesses the generosity and magnanimity of a brave and independent soldier, should not he also acknowledge the erroneous conclusions which his mind came to and frankly declare to the world, that he did do that which he acknowledges he may have done?"

But whatever we may have thought, from the open and manly character which is attributed to General Jackson, he would do, we are now constrained to believe, that he is as far as ever from doing Mr. Clay justice. The argument, as it has been gravely termed & the resolutions of the Tennessee Legislature, disregarding the explanation which General Jackson thought would do Mr. Clay justice assert boldly, the corruption of the present administration, and declare that positive evidence of it would be rather "curious than valuable." Yet strange to tell, the very body which unanimously voted the correctness of this charge, without the production of the shadow of evidence, with the solemn oaths they had taken, registered upon their journals, refused to request their representatives to bring forward an impeachment against the very men they have thus boldly charged. If they could come to a conclusion upon their oaths, that there was corruption in the election of President, would the same evidence upon which they acted, have no effect upon the minds of the constitutional triers of impeachments? They have asserted guilt, and corruption upon their oaths, and yet when asked to have the same thing asserted and brought forward in a tangible shape, where the accused can have an opportunity of defending themselves, they recoil from the investigation. Can the objects and intentions, the true motives by which they were actuated, longer be doubted? True, we have no positive evidence of their motives, but this in their own language would be "*rather curious than valuable.*"

Was more or better evidence wanting of Mr. Clay's entire innocence, of the charges brought against him than the explanations which have already been given to the public, we could appeal to his declaration to Dr. Drake, Mr. Crittenden, and other acquaintances, of unimpeached integrity, that if he should not be returned to the House he would not think of voting for General Jackson.

In a letter he wrote to Dr. Goodman, in 1823, he used the following strong language. "I need not contradict to you a report of a coalition between Mr. Crawford and me. I have come to no understanding, entered into no arrangements, made no promises, entangled myself in no engagements of any sort with any candidate nor with the friends of any candidate—and, so help me God I will not. I neither can nor have, nor will seek to influence or control the choice of my friends, in regard to the other candidates. I believe them, incapable of being influenced by me, or I am sure I should not consider them worthy of being my friends." But General Jackson's statement to Beverly, upon the authority of Mr Buchanan was made in March 1827,—The conversation with Mr Buchanan, took place early in January 1825. In a debate which occurred in the House of Representatives, on the 2d day of February following, respecting the closing of the galleries. Mr Buchanan said, "what are the consequences which will result, from closing the doors of the gallery? We shall impart to the election, an air of mystery. We shall give exercise to the imaginations of the multitude, in conjecturing what scenes are acting within this Hall, Busy rumor, with her hundred tongues, will circulate reports of wicked combinations, and of corruption which have no existence. At present our republic is in its infancy. At this time he entertained "no fear of corruption." The whole circumstances attending the conversation with General Jackson, must then have been fresh in his mind. The charge of corruption had been publicly made by K Bremer, and denied by Mr Clay. It was the topic of universal conversation, & the subject of daily newspaper discussion. Could this "distinguished member of Congress," with a knowledge of the existence of a "corrupt bargain," have declared in the face of the whole nation, and of the world, that corruption had no existence there, and that he entertained no fear of it? He predicted truly busy rumor with her hundred tongues did circulate reports of wicked combinations, and of corruption which had no existence; but stranger than all, long after this prophetic speech had been publicly delivered, and printed in the journals of the day, General Jackson made his charge of corruption against Mr Clay, and referred to the very man to prove it, who had thus denied the existence of any.

We hope we shall be pardoned for thus minutely tracing the history of this story of corruption. The name of our fellow-citizen Henry Clay is dear to us. His fame and his reputation should be dear to Kentucky. He has unceasingly and with true devotion to our best interests, and with a patriotism which has never been questioned until now, devoted his time, his talents, and his best energies to the cause of his country. He rose among us by the strength and superiority of his native genius. At an early period of his life he united his destiny with ours. For more than twenty years, has he acted a conspicuous part in the councils of the nation. His sentiments upon all great national questions, were delivered with an eloquence and a boldness peculiar to himself. In the most animated;

angry and obstinate debates, he has stood firm and unshaken. In the most disastrous periods of our history, when the clouds of adversity seemed to thicken around us, his voice animated his countrymen to exertion, and roused the courage and patriotism of the nation,

He boldly urged us to the last appeal of nations, against the oppressions of a foreign power, sustained us by his undaunted firmness and moral courage, in the hour of trial, and finally aided in the negotiation of an honorable peace. He has been the friend of liberty throughout the world. His eloquence has reached the remotest regions of South America, and when patriot armies have been almost ready to give up the contest, the reading, at the head of their legions, of his speech upon South American emancipation, has roused their drooping energy, and fired their hearts with renewed courage and patriotism. When our Union was shaken to its centre, in the discussion of the Missouri question, when party strife on that subject raged with most violence, the eloquence of Mr Clay was like pouring oil on the troubled waves. The tempest of passion and party feeling was calmed, and Missouri was admitted a member of the Union. With a reputation based on services, which endeared him to his own state, we can not, we do not believe the foul charge of corruption, engendered in disappointment, and nurtured in malignity—the worst feelings of the human heart.

But it is said that the former difference between Mr Clay and Mr Adams was conclusive proof that he was corrupt in voting for him. If this principle could apply to Mr Clay, it surely is equally applicable to others. Was not General Jackson the bitter and inveterate enemy of Mr Crawford, brought out as is now said as a candidate for the Presidency, solely to defeat his prospect, and did he not afterwards become his friend? If it was corrupt in Mr Clay to vote for Mr Adams, when there never had been a personal difference between them, when Mr Clay had only stated, that Mr Adams had committed some errors in relation to the treaty at Ghent, “no doubt unintentionally,” in what light are we to view the sudden reconciliation between Jackson and Benton, avowed, open, deadly enemies? What are we to think of the unexpected, zealous and dictatorial interference of Mr Benton, a Senator of the United States, in behalf of General Jackson in the late election of President? If this argument could prove the guilt of Mr Clay, how much more guilty would he have been if he had voted for General Jackson? He had solemnly declared, upon the floor of Congress, that General Jackson had violated positive orders, and trampled under foot the constitution and laws of the country. The triumph of General Jackson, he had long before declared, would be “*a triumph of the principle of insubordination—a triumph of the military over the civil authority—a triumph over the powers of “Congress”—a triumph over the constitution of the land—and he most devoutly prayed to heaven that it might not prove in its ultimate effects and consequences, a triumph over the liberties of the people.*” Entertaining these views, could he

have hesitated for whom he should vote?

But ingenuity and sophistry, as if determined not to be baffled, have contended that if General Jackson was to blame, Mr Adams, as Secretary of State, defended his course in the controversy on the subject with the Spanish minister, and that Mr Clay therefore should have the same objection, on that score, against him. Those who are acquainted with our relations with Spain at that time, and with the history of that period, could hardly have fallen into so gross an error. Mr Clay publicly approved the defence made by Mr Adams for General Jackson; and distinctly declared that "the subject presented two distinct aspects susceptible in his judgment of the most clear and precise discrimination. The one he would call its foreign, the other its domestic aspect. In regard to the first, he would say, that he approved entirely of the conduct of his Government, and that Spain had no cause of complaint. Having violated an important stipulation of the treaty of 1795, that power had justly subjected herself to all the consequences which ensued upon the entry into her dominions, and it belonged not to her to complain of those measures which resulted from her breach of contract; still less had she a right to examine into the considerations connected with the domestic aspect of the subject."

Mr Clay felt himself constrained to choose between Mr Adams and General Jackson. He knew Mr Adams to be a man of long and tried integrity, taken into the public service by Gen Washington, and recommended by him as "the most valuable character we had abroad." He had received the confidence of Jefferson, of Madison, and of Monroe. He had become intimately acquainted with all our various and multiplied foreign relations. He had practically exhibited his devotion to republican principles and the right of instruction, by resigning his seat as a Senator of the United States, when he could not vote the will of his State in opposition to the administration of Mr Jefferson. He had ably and eloquently, and with manly firmness, opposed British oppressions upon our commerce, and the impressment of our seamen. He had efficiently, and in various stations, sustained our reputation abroad. He had, for eight years, in the administration of the government at home, the first and most important station in the cabinet; which he filled to the entire satisfaction of the public. His great talents, learning and experience were admitted by all. The moral integrity of his private character, commanded the respect of those most violently opposed to him. It was above suspicion, above reproach. Such is the character of the man that Mr Clay is to be condemned for voting for, in opposition to General Jackson.

But party politicians have given partial extracts from the journals of Congress, and attempted to impose the belief upon the public mind, that he was opposed to the acquisition of the territory of Louisiana. If this were true & constituted a disqualification for the office Mr Jefferson, Mr Madison and Mr Monroe surely betrayed the trust of the people in reposing confidence in him. If it is a

a reason why we should not now vote for him, it surely should have been a reason why those men, who were best acquainted with the circumstances of his votes should have withheld their support from him. General Jackson himself being a candidate for the Presidency may be presumed to have been acquainted with his course upon this subject & in his letter to Mr Monroe of 18th March 1827, he said to him "I have no hesitation in saying you have made the best selection to fill the department of state that could be made. Mr Adams in the hour of difficulty will be an able helpmate and I am convinced that his appointment will afford general satisfaction." If he were the best selection for the department of state which could have been made in the opinion of General Jackson, how can the friends of that gentleman consistently contend that his votes on the subject of Louisiana should be any objection to him? General Jackson when he was not his competitor for office, did not think the objections against him were worthy of notice, and how can he expect that the freemen of this country will find objections when he could see none. But no mans views have been more perverted, the political course of no statesman in our country has been more distorted, than that of Mr Adams upon this subject. Having been elected by the republican party of his own state over Timothy Pickens the federal candidate, he took his seat in the Senate of the United States in the fall of 1803; and at the same session he made an elegant and able speech in favor of the purchase of Louisiana. He spoke of the acquisition of that territory in such terms as convinced the nation, that he was not to be classed among those politicians, whose votes were governed by local feeling or whose opinions were the result of sectional jealousy. He voted for the appropriation necessary to carry the treaty into effect; and in his whole course upon this subject he evinced his sincere conviction of the wisdom of this greatest act of Mr Jeffersons administration. But Mr Adams thought that an amendment of the constitution would be necessary preparatory to its admission as an independent state into the Union; it is now ascertained that Mr Jefferson in a letter, he wrote about that period to Mr Dunbar of Mississippi coincided entirely with the views of Mr Adams. To show that his objection was based solely on what he conceived to be a want of a definite grant of power in the construction of the constitution to form new states out of territories acquired by purchase; beyond the limits of the United States, he proposed and advocated an amendment which would meet the emergency which had arisen. Had he been opposed to the acquisition of the territory he would not thus have used his influence and his exertions to remove all difficulties about its future government. When his whole course upon this subject shall be thoroughly investigated and properly understood, we hazard nothing in saying in his own language "it will stand the test of human scrutiny, of talents and of time."

In conclusion we would ask what can Kentucky promise herself by the support of General Jackson? Will the great American sys-

tem, domestic Manufactures and Internal Improvements so essential to our prosperity, receive in a greater degree the fostering care of the government? Does his vote in 1824 to strike out the duty of Scotch bagging entitle him to our peculiar consideration? Does his final assent to the compromise of 3 3-4 cents per-square yard on that article give him any strong claims to our support? In what instance has he advocated a measure which would advance our interest, or shown the least respect to our interest, and character? Under his command a great and glorious victory was achieved at New Orleans, but the same document which will transmit the account of this battle, to posterity and which is lodged in the archives of the nation contains the statement of the inglorious flight of the "Kentucky" reinforcements, drawing after them by their example the remainder of the forces." When called upon to correct that, which the unanimous sentiment of those who have investigated the facts in this case, pronounced an "unmerited imputation," he has added insult to injury. When proven by the most respectable men of the country that we had a thousand to, twelve hundred effective soldiers in the battle on the left bank of the river where glory was gained, he persisted to the last in asserting that there was only five hundred and fifty; and afterwards contended that there were even a less number. When shown to the satisfaction of any unprejudiced mind, that there were only about 170 Kentuckians on the right bank of the river, badly armed, and who had been constantly on the march for 14 hours without receiving sustenance of any kind, he refused to correct the expression in his report that there was "a strong detachment of Kentucky troops" sent over. When it was established before the court martial by unquestionable testimony that these troops fired from three to seven rounds before they retreated, he did not hesitate to declare that the witnesses had perjured themselves. In his controversy with Gen. Adair as late as 1817 he tauntingly says to him "you are seeking to convince the world that men are heroes who ingloriously fled before the enemy." At another time he says "you cannot write cowards into heroes," In his order discharging the troops, Gen. Adair is the only officer from Kentucky who is complimented, and the notice of him, ("that troops would always be brave when their leaders were so") was a sneering sarcasm, upon what he termed the strong detachment of Kentucky troops. Colonels, Majors and Captains from other states received their due meed of praise. We would be pleased to know when and where he has ever done justice to our injured reputation. If these things constitute any claim to our support, then indeed might we exclaim in the language of one who is now enlisted under his manners, "Oh Kentucky, Kentucky, will you be like the Spaniel that licks the dust from the foot that kicks him."







